

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

BEFORE THE  
SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE  
INDEPENDENT CITIZENS' OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE  
TO THE  
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE  
ORGANIZED PURSUANT TO THE  
CALIFORNIA STEM CELL RESEARCH AND CURES ACT  
REGULAR MEETING

LOCATION: VIA ZOOM

DATE: MAY 3, 2021  
2 P.M.

REPORTER: BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR  
CSR. NO. 7152

FILE NO.: 2021-10

**133 HENNA COURT, SANDPOINT, IDAHO 83864  
208-255-5453 208-920-3543 DRAIBE@HOTMAIL.COM**

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

**I N D E X**

<b>ITEM DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>PAGE NO.</b>
<b>OPEN SESSION</b>	
1. CALL TO ORDER.	3
2. ROLL CALL.	3
3. CONSIDERATION OF EDUC SPARK CONCEPT PLAN.	4
4. CONSIDERATION OF SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING FOR EXISTING ALPHA STEM CELL CLINICS AWARDEES.	26
5. PUBLIC COMMENT.	NONE
6. ADJOURNMENT.	41

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MAY 3, 2021; 2 P.M.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. I'D LIKE TO WELCOME EVERYBODY TO THE MAY 3D MEETING OF THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE ICOC. I'M GOING TO BE PINCH HITTING TODAY FOR OS AS HE WAS UNABLE TO MAKE IT. MARIA, COULD YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

MS. BONNEVILLE: SURE.

OS STEWARD. DEBORAH DEAS. ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.

DR. DULIEGE: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.

DR. GASSON: YES.

MS. BONNEVILLE: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.

DR. GOLDSTEIN: YEAH.

MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS. STEVE JUELSGAARD.

MR. JUELSGAARD: PRESENT.

MS. BONNEVILLE: SHLOMO MELMED.

DR. MELMED: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.

MR. TORRES: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.

CHAIRMAN THOMAS: HERE.

MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 DR. VUORI: HERE.

2 THANK YOU.

3 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THANK YOU, MARIA.

4 SO THE FIRST ITEM FOR DISCUSSION TODAY IS  
5 CONSIDERATION OF THE SPARK CONCEPT PLAN. WE'RE  
6 GOING TO HAVE KELLY GIVE US THE PRESENTATION. SO,  
7 KELLY.

8 DR. SHEPARD: HI. CAN EVERYBODY HEAR ME?

9 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.

10 DR. SHEPARD: OKAY. I'M GOING TO ATTEMPT  
11 TO SHARE MY SCREEN FOR THE SLIDES.

12 THANK YOU, MEMBERS OF THE SCIENCE  
13 COMMITTEE AND ANYBODY WHO ELSE WHO'S WATCHING TODAY.  
14 I'M HERE TO PRESENT FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION A  
15 PROPOSAL TO REISSUE CIRM'S SPARK AWARDS. OH, DEAR.  
16 I THINK I HAVE MY WRONG SLIDES OPEN. ONE SECOND. I  
17 APOLOGIZE. THIS IS THE FIRST TIME I'VE SHARED MY  
18 SCREEN DURING A BOARD MEETING. HERE WE GO. CAN  
19 EVERYBODY SEE THAT?

20 MS. BONNEVILLE: YES.

21 DR. SHEPARD: GREAT. THE CONCEPT PROPOSAL  
22 TO REISSUE THE SPARK AWARD TRAINING PROGRAM. SPARK  
23 IS AN ACRONYM FOR SUMMER PROGRAM TO ACCELERATE  
24 REGENERATIVE MEDICINE KNOWLEDGE. SO I'LL JUST BACK  
25 UP A LITTLE BIT BRIEFLY TO REMIND YOU THAT CIRM HAS

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 MADE INVESTMENTS IN FIVE MAJOR PILLARS. WE THINK OF  
2 OUR RESEARCH PIPELINE AS THAT INCLUDING THE  
3 DISCOVERY, TRANSLATION, AND CLINICAL PROGRAMS, BUT  
4 WE ALSO HAVE SUPPORTED AN EDUCATIONAL PIPELINE THAT  
5 PRODUCES TRAINEES OF ALL LEVELS TO PARTICIPATE IN  
6 THE WORKFORCE TO HELP BRING REGENERATIVE MEDICINE TO  
7 PATIENTS IN NEED.

8 SO IN MY PRESENTATION TODAY, I'D JUST LIKE  
9 TO GIVE YOU A LITTLE BIT OF BACKGROUND ABOUT THE  
10 SPARK PROGRAM BEFORE I GO INTO THE NEW CONCEPT  
11 ITSELF. SO CIRM HAS BEEN FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES TO  
12 SUPPORT TRAINING AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT IN STEM  
13 CELL-BASED RESEARCH THROUGH OUR VARIOUS EDUCATION  
14 PROGRAMS, AS I JUST ALLUDED.

15 CIRM IS PROPOSING TO RELAUNCH THE SPARK  
16 AWARD, OTHERWISE KNOWN AS THE EDUC 3 AWARD, WHICH  
17 SUPPORT SUMMER INTERNSHIPS FOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS.  
18 HISTORICALLY CIRM HAS SUPPORTED THESE HIGH SCHOOL  
19 INTERNSHIPS THROUGH TWO DIFFERENT RFA'S. THE  
20 ORIGINAL AWARD RFA WAS THE CREATIVITY AWARD WHICH  
21 WAS ISSUED IN 2011, AND A REVISED VERSION OF THIS  
22 PROGRAM RENAMED THE SPARK AWARDS WAS AWARDED IN  
23 2015.

24 AS WAS THE CASE THEN AND AS IS THE CASE  
25 NOW, FEDERAL FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES FOR HIGH SCHOOL

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 LEVEL RESEARCH TRAINING, PARTICULARLY IN THE  
2 REGENERATIVE MEDICINE SPACE, ARE LIMITED AND  
3 DISPARATE. WE WILL BE PROPOSING MODIFICATIONS TO  
4 THE SPARK CONCEPT TO BRING THE PROGRAM INTO BETTER  
5 ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROPOSITION 14 OBJECTIVES AND TO  
6 BETTER REFLECT PRESENT CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES.  
7 AND I WILL BE DETAILING THESE IN MY PRESENTATION.

8 SO A LITTLE BIT OF BACKGROUND ABOUT OUR  
9 TRAINING PIPELINE. WE'VE SUPPORTED TRAINING  
10 PROGRAMS FOR THREE DIFFERENT LEVELS. WE HAVE THE  
11 RESEARCH TRAINING GRANTS, WHICH SUPPORTED  
12 PREDOCTORAL AND PRE-M.D. STUDENTS AS WELL AS  
13 POSTDOCTORAL FELLOWS AND CLINICAL FELLOWS. WE ALSO  
14 SUPPORT THE BRIDGES PROGRAM, WHICH PROVIDE TRAINING  
15 FOR UNDERGRADUATE LEVEL AND MASTER'S STUDENTS AROUND  
16 THE STATE; AND, FINALLY, WHAT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT  
17 TODAY, THE SPARK AWARDS, WHICH SUPPORT RESEARCH  
18 INTERNSHIPS FOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS.

19 NOW, IN JANUARY I CAME AND PRESENTED AN  
20 OVERVIEW OF THE OUTCOMES OF THESE PROGRAMS OVER THE  
21 YEARS, AND WE NOTED THAT WE WOULD BE BRINGING  
22 CONCEPTS TO RENEW THESE PROGRAMS TO YOU. WE DID  
23 BRING RENEWAL CONCEPTS FOR BOTH THE RESEARCH  
24 TRAINING AND BRIDGES PROGRAMS, WHICH WERE EXPIRING.  
25 THE RESEARCH TRAINING PROGRAM HAD BEEN DORMANT, AND

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 THE BRIDGES PROGRAMS, THE CURRENT AWARDS WERE  
2 ACTUALLY ENDING. AND THE BOARD DID APPROVE THOSE  
3 NEW CONCEPTS IN FEBRUARY FOR BOTH OF THOSE PROGRAMS.  
4 AT THAT TIME WE MENTIONED WE WOULD ALSO BE BRINGING  
5 THE NEW SPARK CONCEPT FOR CONSIDERATION IN THE NEAR  
6 FUTURE, AND THAT NEAR FUTURE IS NOW.

7 SO THE SPARK TRAINING PROGRAM CONCEPT HAS  
8 THE FOLLOWING OBJECTIVES. THE GOAL IS REALLY TO  
9 INSPIRE, INTRODUCE, AND PREPARE CALIFORNIA HIGH  
10 SCHOOL STUDENTS ABOUT THE FIELD OF REGENERATIVE  
11 MEDICINE AS IT RELATES TO HUMAN DISEASE. THESE  
12 AWARDS PROVIDE SUMMER TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES AND  
13 BROADEN THE PARTICIPATION IN STEM CELL, GENE  
14 THERAPY, AND RELATED RESEARCH TO HIGH SCHOOL  
15 STUDENTS WHO REPRESENT THE DIVERSITY CALIFORNIA'S  
16 POPULATION AND WHO MIGHT NOT OTHERWISE HAVE  
17 OPPORTUNITIES TO TAKE PART IN SUMMER RESEARCH  
18 INTERNSHIPS DUE TO SOCIOECONOMIC CONSTRAINTS.

19 THE GOAL OF THESE PROGRAMS IS ALSO TO  
20 FOSTER A COMMITMENT AMONG TRAINEES TO THE GOAL OF  
21 ACCELERATING THE DELIVERY OF STEM CELL-BASED AND  
22 GENE THERAPY TREATMENTS TO PATIENTS WITH UNMET  
23 NEEDS.

24 WHILE EACH SPARK PROGRAM MIGHT BE A LITTLE  
25 BIT DIFFERENT, THEY ALL HAVE SOME FEATURES IN

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 COMMON. IN ALL CASES, A QUALIFIED PROGRAM DIRECTOR  
2 BASED AT THE AWARDEE INSTITUTION IS RESPONSIBLE FOR  
3 MANAGING AND COORDINATING ALL ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED  
4 BY THESE PROGRAMS AS WELL AS THE RECRUITMENT OF  
5 DIVERSE AND QUALIFIED STUDENTS. IN ADDITION TO  
6 PREPARATORY COURSES AND WORKSHOPS, A KEY FEATURE OF  
7 THESE ARE, OF COURSE, THE SUMMER INTERNSHIPS, WHICH  
8 ARE HANDS-ON, MENTORED RESEARCH AT HOST LABORATORIES  
9 AT THE AWARDEE'S INSTITUTION WHICH ARE NONPROFIT  
10 RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES OR COLLEGES OR PARTNERING  
11 INSTITUTIONS WITH THE STEM CELL, GENE THERAPY, OR  
12 REGENERATIVE MEDICINE FOCUS.

13 IN ADDITION TO INTERNSHIPS, THE STUDENTS  
14 PARTICIPATE IN FORMAL COMMUNITY OUTREACH AND PATIENT  
15 ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES. AND AT THE CULMINATION OF  
16 EACH PROGRAM, THERE IS AN ANNUAL SPARK POSTER DAY  
17 WHERE THE STUDENTS FROM ALL THE DIFFERENT SPARK  
18 PROGRAMS ARE BROUGHT TOGETHER TO SHARE THEIR  
19 RESEARCH WITH ONE ANOTHER AND THEIR CIRM TEAM AND  
20 THEIR FAMILIES.

21 SO WHAT IS DIFFERENT ABOUT WHAT WE'RE  
22 PROPOSING TODAY? THE NEW SPARK CONCEPT THAT WE ARE  
23 PROPOSING ESSENTIALLY BUILDS OFF THE ESTABLISHED  
24 SPARK PLATFORM THAT HAS BEEN SUCCESSFUL SINCE 2011,  
25 BUT WE ARE PROPOSING SOME UPDATES AND IMPROVEMENTS.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 THE FIRST IS THAT WE PROPOSE TO EXPAND THE ALLOWABLE  
2 SCOPE OF THE RESEARCH PROJECTS BEYOND STEM CELL  
3 SCIENCE TO INCLUDE GENE THERAPY AND RELATED  
4 REGENERATIVE MEDICINE RESEARCH IN ACCORDANCE WITH  
5 PROPOSITION 14. THESE ARE THE SAME TYPES OF CHANGES  
6 WE PROPOSED AND OUR BOARD APPROVED FOR THE BRIDGES  
7 AND THE RESEARCH TRAINING GRANT PROGRAMS THAT WE  
8 BROUGHT TO YOU IN FEBRUARY.

9 WE ARE ALSO PROPOSING TO ALLOW THE  
10 INSTITUTIONS HOSTING SPARK AWARDS TO PARTNER WITH  
11 ANOTHER ORGANIZATION IN ORDER TO INCREASE THE  
12 AVAILABILITY AND THE DIVERSITY AND TYPES OF HOST  
13 LABORATORIES IN WHICH THE STUDENTS MAY BE ABLE TO  
14 INTERN. AS WITH ALL OF THE CONTINUING AND NEW CIRM  
15 CONCEPTS, WE ARE PROVIDING MORE FORMAL REQUIREMENTS  
16 TO MAINTAIN AND STRENGTHEN THE FOCUS ON DIVERSITY,  
17 EQUITY, AND INCLUSION. AND CONSISTENT WITH THE  
18 LANGUAGE OF PROPOSITION 14, APPLICATIONS WILL BE  
19 PRIORITIZED THAT OFFER MATCHING FUNDS OR VERIFIED  
20 IN-KIND SUPPORT AND THOSE THAT ENHANCE THE  
21 GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF TRAINING AND  
22 SOCIOECONOMIC DIVERSITY.

23 AND FINALLY, WE ARE PROPOSING SOME CHANGES  
24 TO THE OVERALL AWARD AMOUNT AND SOME CHANGES TO THE  
25 BUDGET STRUCTURE THAT I WILL GO OVER ON MY NEXT

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 SLIDE. WE THINK THESE CHANGES ARE BETTER IN TODAY'S  
2 ECONOMY AND WILL AFFORD MORE FLEXIBILITY FOR  
3 RECRUITING AND APPOINTING A DIVERSE COHORT THAT  
4 INCLUDES SOCIOECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS.

5 TO GIVE YOU AN IDEA OF WHAT I'M SPEAKING  
6 TALKING ABOUT WHEN I AM TALKING ABOUT BUDGET UPDATES  
7 AND CHANGES, I WANT TO GIVE YOU AN IDEA OF WHAT WE  
8 HAVE BEEN DOING ALL ALONG AND WHAT WE'RE PROPOSING  
9 TO DO NOW.

10 SO IN THIS TABLE, I'M JUST GOING TO WALK  
11 YOU THROUGH, THE COSTS THAT GO INTO AN INDIVIDUAL  
12 SPARK AWARD FALL INTO THE CATEGORIES THAT ARE LISTED  
13 TO THE LEFT. SO SOME OF THE FUNDING GOES TO SUPPORT  
14 STIPENDS FOR THE TRAINEES THEMSELVES. SOME OF THE  
15 FUNDING GOES TO SUPPORT SOME STIPENDS FOR MENTORS OR  
16 THE PERSON WHO IS WORKING DAY TO DAY TO HELP THE  
17 STUDENTS DURING THEIR INTERNSHIP. THERE IS A SMALL  
18 AMOUNT OF MONEY FOR RESEARCH-RELATED FUNDS TO OFFSET  
19 THE COST OF THE HOST LAB, AND THERE'S SOME FUNDING  
20 THAT SUPPORTS TRAINEES FOR THE TRAVEL TO THE ANNUAL  
21 CONFERENCE.

22 IN ADDITION TO THOSE TRAINEE COSTS, THERE  
23 ARE ALSO UP TO \$2500 PER STUDENT FOR PROGRAM  
24 ADMINISTRATION AND INDIRECT COSTS. THIS MEANS THE  
25 TOTAL COST PER TRAINEE IS \$7,975, AND EACH OF THESE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 PROGRAMS WAS BUDGETED TO SUPPORT UP TO TEN TRAINEES  
2 PER YEAR.

3 AS YOU CAN SEE FROM THE SECOND AND THIRD  
4 COLUMNS, THE BUDGET REALLY DID NOT CHANGE AT ALL  
5 BETWEEN 2011 AND 2015. THE AMOUNT OF EACH OF THOSE  
6 CATEGORIES STAYED THE SAME.

7 IN THE ORANGE COLUMN ON THE RIGHT IS WHAT  
8 WE'RE PROPOSING FOR THE NEW CONCEPT. THE BIGGEST  
9 CHANGE YOU WILL NOTE IS THE INCREASE IN THE LEVEL OF  
10 STIPEND UP TO \$4500. THIS HAS BEEN RECALIBRATED TO  
11 ALIGN WITH THE STATE MINIMUM WAGE FOR AN EIGHT-WEEK  
12 INTERNSHIP. NOW, YOU WILL NOTE THAT THERE IS A  
13 ZERO LISTED FOR MENTOR STIPENDS AND RESEARCH-RELATED  
14 FUNDS. RATHER THAN JUST TAKING THAT MONEY OUT OF  
15 THE BUDGET, THAT HAS BEEN MOVED UNDER THE PROGRAM  
16 ADMINISTRATION COST, WHICH HAS BEEN ALSO RAISED FROM  
17 2500 TO 4,000. WE BELIEVE THAT THIS WILL ALLOW MORE  
18 FLEXIBILITY. THE PROGRAM DIRECTORS CAN STILL USE  
19 SOME OF THAT FUNDING TO SUPPORT MENTORS WHERE IT'S  
20 NEEDED; BUT WHAT WE'VE LEARNED FROM MANAGING THESE  
21 PROGRAMS OVER THE PAST TEN YEARS OR SO IS THAT IN  
22 MANY CASES THE MENTOR STIPENDS AREN'T ACTUALLY  
23 NECESSARY, AND IN SOME CASES WE'VE BEEN TOLD THE  
24 RESEARCH-RELATED FUNDS ARE MORE DIFFICULT TO  
25 ADMINISTER THAN WORTH GIVEN THE VALUE. SO WE FELT

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 THAT, AND THE PROGRAM DIRECTORS INDICATED A LITTLE  
2 BIT MORE FLEXIBILITY WITH WHAT THEY CAN DO FOR THE  
3 ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS WOULD BE HELPFUL FOR THEM.  
4 THAT'S BASICALLY THE BASIS OF THE NEW FUNDING  
5 LEVELS. AND THE TOTAL COST PER TRAINEE UNDER THIS  
6 NEW PROPOSAL IS 10,175, WHICH I THINK IS JUST ABOUT  
7 A 20-PERCENT INCREASE OVER WHAT IT WAS PREVIOUSLY.

8 JUST TO SUMMARIZE THIS NEW CONCEPT THAT WE  
9 ARE PROPOSING, WE WOULD BE ASKING FOR AN ALLOCATION  
10 TO SUPPORT TEN SPARK AWARDS. CURRENTLY THERE ARE  
11 SEVEN THAT ARE ACTIVE, BUT THEY ARE ALL ENDING WHEN  
12 THE FINAL COHORT OF STUDENTS COMPLETE THEIR  
13 INTERNSHIPS THIS SUMMER. SO WE WOULD PROPOSE TO  
14 SUPPORT TEN NEW AWARDS WHICH WOULD BE A TOTAL  
15 INVESTMENT OF \$509,000 PER AWARD. THIS WOULD  
16 SUPPORT 500 TRAINEES IN ALL. AND AS I MENTIONED ON  
17 THE PREVIOUS SLIDE, THE DIRECT STUDENT COST WOULD BE  
18 5250 FOR OVERHEAD AND PROGRAM ADMIN WOULD BE 4925,  
19 WHICH MEANS A TOTAL COST PER STUDENT PER YEAR WOULD  
20 BE 10,175, WHICH IS A 22-PERCENT INCREASE SINCE THE  
21 2015 RFA, BUT ACTUALLY IT'S A 22-PERCENT INCREASE  
22 SINCE THE 2011 RFA BECAUSE I SHOWED YOU THE COSTS  
23 WEREN'T ACTUALLY RAISED AT ALL IN 2015.

24 SO IN SUM, THE REQUESTED ACTION FOR THIS  
25 NEW CONCEPT WOULD BE AN ALLOCATION OF \$5.1 MILLION,

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 WHICH WOULD SUPPORT UP TO TEN NEW SPARK AWARDS, EACH  
2 WITH A FIVE-YEAR DURATION THAT LEAD TO 500 TRAINEES  
3 AT A COST UP TO \$509,000 PER AWARD. AND I CAN STOP  
4 THERE AND TAKE QUESTIONS IF ANYBODY HAS ANY.

5 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, KELLY. ARE  
6 THERE QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE  
7 BOARD?

8 DR. DULIEGE: YES. FIRST OF ALL, THANK  
9 YOU VERY MUCH FOR SHARING THIS PROPOSAL WITH US AND  
10 FOR THE CLARITY OF THE BUDGET ALLOCATION SO THAT WE  
11 DON'T HAVE WORK SO MUCH THROUGH AND IT'S EXTREMELY  
12 CLEAR.

13 THE ONLY CLARIFICATION IS THIS IS, IN  
14 FACT, A SUMMER INTERNSHIP. IS THAT WHAT IT'S  
15 CALLED, SUMMER INTERNSHIP?

16 DR. SHEPARD: YES.

17 DR. DULIEGE: WHAT THAT SAYS IS THAT WE  
18 CONTINUE TO SUPPORT THE FACT THAT SUMMER INTERNSHIPS  
19 SHOULD BE PAID SO AS TO NOT DISCRIMINATE BETWEEN  
20 HIGH SCHOOLERS WHO CAN AFFORD NOT TO WORK OVER THE  
21 SUMMER AND LEARN VERSUS THOSE WHO WOULD HAVE TO HAVE  
22 AN INCOME DURING THE SUMMER WHILE THEY'RE LEARNING.  
23 IS THAT FAIR?

24 DR. SHEPARD: YES.

25 DR. DULIEGE: I APPLAUD THIS. THIS IS

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 VERY MUCH A LONG EFFORT TO BE EQUITABLE IN GENERAL  
2 IN LIFE. GREAT.

3 DR. SHEPARD: THANK YOU. ANY OTHER  
4 QUESTIONS?

5 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: KELLY.

6 MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD HAS HIS  
7 HAND RAISED.

8 MR. JUELSGAARD: REMIND ME WHEN YOU  
9 EVALUATE THESE PROGRAMS FOR WHAT YOU HOPE THEY  
10 ACHIEVE. HOW DO YOU DO THAT?

11 DR. SHEPARD: WELL, THEY SUBMIT PROGRESS  
12 REPORTS AND THEY TELL US HOW THE EFFORTS WENT OVER  
13 THE PAST YEAR. AND FOR EVERY TRAINEE THAT COMES  
14 INTO THE PROGRAM, CIRM RECEIVES AN APPOINTMENT FORM  
15 THAT LET'S US KNOW WHOSE LABS THEY'VE GONE TO AND  
16 WHEN THEY STARTED. THESE APPOINTMENT FORMS DO  
17 REQUEST SOME BASIC INFORMATION ABOUT DEMOGRAPHICS.  
18 AND SO IT'S NOT MANDATORY. IT'S SELF-REPORTED. BUT  
19 I WOULD SAY THAT I DON'T THINK OUR APPOINTMENT  
20 FORMS, WE AREN'T ABLE TO UNDERSTAND WHAT THE  
21 SOCIOECONOMIC SITUATION IS OF THE DIFFERENT  
22 TRAINEES, BUT THE PROGRAM HAS ALWAYS BEEN TARGETING  
23 RECRUITING A DIVERSE COHORT OF STUDENTS. I THINK  
24 WHAT I'VE SEEN FROM THE PROGRESS REPORTS IS THAT  
25 THAT IS THE CASE.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 I KNOW THAT WHEN, AS WAS THE CASE WITH THE  
2 BRIDGES AWARDS AND THE TRAINING GRANT AWARDS, WHEN  
3 APPLICATIONS COME IN TO EITHER BE RENEWED FOR  
4 FUNDING OR NEW APPLICATIONS COME IN, THEY WILL BE  
5 REQUIRED TO REPORT MORE EXTENSIVELY ON THEIR OWN  
6 INTERNAL DATA ABOUT THEIR EFFORT. AND SO THAT'S AN  
7 OPPORTUNITY THAT WE WILL HAVE TO ALSO EVALUATE THAT.

8 MR. JUELSGAARD: DO YOU GET ANY FEEDBACK  
9 FROM THE PARTICIPANTS?

10 DR. SHEPARD: YES. WE DO GET FEEDBACK  
11 FROM THE PARTICIPANTS. SO THIS PROGRAM HAS -- WE  
12 HAVE TESTIMONIALS, OF COURSE, FROM SOME OF THE  
13 PROGRAM DIRECTORS, AND WE HAVE OUTCOMES. AND SOME  
14 OF THE STUDENTS WHO WERE IN THE PROGRAMS EARLIER, WE  
15 HAVE INFORMATION ON WHERE THEY'VE GONE TO COLLEGE.  
16 NOW, WE DON'T HAVE A COMPLETE STORY BECAUSE A LOT OF  
17 THESE STUDENTS DO THESE INTERNSHIPS AS SOPHOMORES OR  
18 JUNIORS, AND SOME OF THEM ARE ONLY GRADUATING AND  
19 JUST STARTING FROM COLLEGE.

20 BACK IN JANUARY I PRESENTED SOME OF THE  
21 OUTCOMES WE DID KNOW ABOUT FROM A SURVEY OF A SUBSET  
22 OF THOSE WHO HAVE STARTED COLLEGE. AND I DON'T HAVE  
23 THAT IN FRONT OF ME, BUT HALF OF THEM WERE ENROLLED  
24 IN UC'S, AND I BELIEVE THAT ANOTHER SIGNIFICANT  
25 SUBSET OF THEM WERE IN COLLEGES OR UNIVERSITIES

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 OUTSIDE OF THE STATE OR IN OTHER COLLEGES AND  
2 UNIVERSITIES IN CALIFORNIA, AND THE MAJORITY OF THEM  
3 THAT WE'VE TRACKED HAVE CHOSEN TO GO INTO STEM.

4 SO THE STORY IS INCOMPLETE AT THIS POINT  
5 BECAUSE WE DON'T HAVE ALL THE GRADUATION DATA FROM  
6 ALL THESE STUDENTS.

7 MR. JUELSGAARD: ONE LAST QUESTION. SO  
8 THESE ARE FIVE-YEAR GRANTS. DO YOU HAVE A WAY OF  
9 MONITORING THE INSTITUTIONS TO BE SURE THEY'RE DOING  
10 WHAT THEY ARE DOING AND THE ABILITY TO STOP FUNDING  
11 THEM IF THEY'RE NOT SUCCESSFULLY RUNNING A PROGRAM?

12 DR. SHEPARD: YES, ABSOLUTELY WE DO. THEY  
13 SUBMIT ANNUAL PROGRESS REPORTS TO US, BUT THEY ALSO  
14 SUBMIT THE APPOINTMENT FORMS WHEN THEY ARE ABLE TO  
15 PLACE STUDENTS IN A LAB. SO EACH PROGRAM HAS UP TO  
16 TEN SLOTS PER YEAR, SO WE KNOW EXACTLY HOW MANY  
17 PEOPLE ARE APPOINTED, WE KNOW THEIR NAMES, WE KNOW  
18 THEIR BIRTH DATES, WE KNOW WHAT HIGH SCHOOL THEY  
19 WENT TO. WE DO HAVE ALL THAT INFORMATION INTERNALLY  
20 AT CIRM. AND AT SOME POINT, IF THE BOARD WANTED TO  
21 HEAR MORE ABOUT WHAT WE HAVE COLLECTED, THAT IS  
22 SOMETHING WE COULD BRING TO YOU. BUT WE DO TRACK  
23 ALL OF THAT, AND WE DO MONITOR THEIR PROGRESS EVERY  
24 YEAR TO MAKE SURE THAT THEY'RE KEEPING UP WITH THEIR  
25 OWN GOALS, THE GOALS OF THE PROGRAM, AND WE DO HAVE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 THE ABILITY TO STOP FUNDING OR PUT IT ON HOLD OR  
2 SPEAK TO THEM.

3 THE STUDENTS HAVE ALWAYS COME TOGETHER AT  
4 THE END OF EACH YEAR FOR POSTER DAY SO WE'RE ABLE TO  
5 MEET THOSE STUDENTS AND INTERACT WITH THEM. WE'RE  
6 ABLE TO HEAR ABOUT THEIR POSTERS. WE WERE UNABLE TO  
7 DO THAT LAST SUMMER BECAUSE OF THE PANDEMIC. IN  
8 FACT, THESE AWARDS WERE SCHEDULED TO ACTUALLY END  
9 LAST SUMMER, BUT THE STUDENTS THAT WERE RECRUITED  
10 LAST YEAR ALL DEFERRED TO THIS YEAR IN ORDER TO HAVE  
11 THE OPPORTUNITY TO DO -- FOR AT LEAST A CHANCE TO DO  
12 THEIR INTERNSHIPS IN PERSON.

13 MR. TORRES: MR. CHAIR, IS STEVE DONE?

14 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I THINK SO.

15 MR. TORRES: GREAT. WHAT KELLY JUST  
16 MENTIONED IS VERY ANECDOTAL BECAUSE WHEN I HELPED  
17 START THIS PROGRAM, THE SPARKS PROGRAM, IN 2011 WITH  
18 STAFF, IT WAS VERY CLEAR THAT THERE WAS A VERY  
19 ENTHUSIASTIC RESPONSE. AND I KNOW, J.T., YOU'VE  
20 BEEN TO SOME OF THE GRADUATION CEREMONIES AND I'VE  
21 BEEN TO ALMOST ALL OF THEM. AND YOU REALLY FIND OUT  
22 THE ENTHUSIASTIC SUPPORT OF THE PARENTS, OF THE  
23 TEACHERS, AND OF THE STUDENTS THEMSELVES WHO ARE  
24 JUST REMARKABLE IN TERMS OF THEIR ACHIEVEMENTS AND  
25 IN TERMS OF THEIR POSTER PRESENTATION. AND THERE'S

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 JUST A SELF-CONFIDENCE, AND THERE'S A  
2 SELF-PROPULSION TO CONTINUE TO EXCEL IN THIS WHOLE  
3 ARENA BECAUSE OF THE ENTHUSIASTIC PARTICIPATION OF  
4 THESE STUDENTS, WHICH WE MAY NOT BE ABLE TO MONITOR  
5 SOCIOECONOMIC OR DIVERSITY AS CAREFULLY AS WOULD BE  
6 PREFERABLE, BUT WE DO KNOW THAT WE'RE PROVIDING  
7 OUTREACH TO THOSE HIGH SCHOOLS.

8 AND I CAN SPEAK ESPECIALLY ABOUT THOSE IN  
9 SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, WHICH HAVE HAD AN IMPACT ON  
10 SOCIOECONOMIC STUDENT POPULATIONS IN THOSE REGIONS.  
11 ONE OF THEM WAS FRANCISCO BRAVO HIGH SCHOOL -- MED  
12 SCHOOL IN LOS ANGELES. FRANCISCO BRAVO HAPPENED TO  
13 BE A DEAR FRIEND OF MINE, ONE OF THE REAGAN  
14 APPOINTEES AND A DOCTOR WHO PRACTICED IN BOYLE  
15 HEIGHTS IN EAST L.A., WHICH WAS PROFOUNDLY  
16 SIGNIFICANT, YET HE ALWAYS SUPPORTED STUDENTS AND  
17 GETTING INVOLVED IN THAT ARENA. SO WE MAY NOT HAVE,  
18 ALTHOUGH WE HAVE THE RAW DATA AT CIRM, WE MAY NOT  
19 HAVE THE PROFILES AS DETAILED AS WE WOULD LIKE, BUT  
20 ALL THE ANECDOTAL STORIES THAT I'VE BEEN ABLE TO  
21 COLLECT OVER THE YEARS ARE CERTAINLY ENTHUSIASTIC.

22 DR. SHEPARD: I WOULD ALSO ADD THAT PART  
23 OF THE SPARK PROGRAM IS A SOCIAL MEDIA COMPONENT FOR  
24 THE COMMUNITY OUTREACH. SO IT IS POSSIBLE TO FIND  
25 THE BLOGS AND SOME OF THE WORK THAT THE STUDENTS

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 THEMSELVES HAVE DONE OVER THE PAST YEARS AND SEE IN  
2 PERSON WHAT THEY'VE BEEN DOING AND THEIR  
3 EXPERIENCES.

4 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: LARRY, BEFORE WE GET TO  
5 YOU, I JUST WANT TO FOLLOW ART VERY QUICKLY HERE.  
6 AS EVERYBODY HERE KNOWS, I'VE SAID THIS SORT OF  
7 REPEATEDLY, THIS IS ONE OF MY ABSOLUTE FAVORITE  
8 PROGRAMS THAT CIRM HAS. I, LIKE ART, HAVE BEEN, I  
9 THINK, TO EVERY ONE OF THE GRADUATION CEREMONIES  
10 THAT ARE HELD LATE SUMMER WHERE EVERYBODY CONVENES  
11 AND, AS KELLY SAYS, THEY DO THEIR POSTERS AND GIVE  
12 EXPLANATIONS TO THE WORK THEY'VE BEEN DOING. AND  
13 IT'S YEAR IN, YEAR OUT MIND BLOWING HOW COMPETENT  
14 THESE KIDS SEEM HAVING COME OUT OF JUST A  
15 SEVERAL-WEEK PROGRAM, HAVING GONE IN JUST HAVING HAD  
16 SOME EXPOSURE TO STEM CELL BIOLOGY IN THEIR BIOLOGY  
17 CLASSES AT SCHOOL. AND THEY ALL COME OUT SOUNDING  
18 LIKE PH.D.'S.

19 AND REPEATEDLY YOU HEAR THAT THE  
20 EXPERIENCE FOR THESE KIDS IS TRANSFORMATIVE, AND IT  
21 REALLY ENERGIZES THEM AND GALVANIZES THEIR DESIRE TO  
22 PURSUE THIS LATER ON IN THEIR EDUCATION. IT'S JUST  
23 A TERRIFIC PROGRAM THAT HAS BEEN VERY SUCCESSFUL.  
24 AND AS WE EXPAND IT, I'M SURE WE'LL BE EVEN MORE SO.  
25 AND AT A TIME WHEN THERE'S INCREASING EMPHASIS ON

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 GETTING KIDS INTERESTED TO ULTIMATELY ENTER THE  
2 WORKPLACE AS THE FIELD MATURES, THIS IS THE PERFECT  
3 VEHICLE TO GET THEM STARTED. SO I CAN'T SPEAK  
4 HIGHLY ENOUGH OF THE PROGRAM AND, KELLY, THE WORK  
5 YOU'VE DONE TO MAKE IT WORK AND TO BE A TREMENDOUS  
6 SUCCESS EVERY YEAR. SO I COULD NOT BE MORE  
7 ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT THIS.

8 LARRY.

9 MR. GOLDSTEIN: THANK YOU, J.T. SO I  
10 APPRECIATE THE ENTHUSIASM, AND, OF COURSE, I DO SEE  
11 THE VALUE OF ANECDOTAL ENTHUSIASM. BUT I GUESS WHAT  
12 I DO HEAR MISSING FROM THIS CONVERSATION IS  
13 OUTCOMES. SO HAS IT BEEN CONCLUDED THAT OUTCOMES  
14 DATA ARE JUST TOO DIFFICULT TO GET IN TERMS OF  
15 WHETHER THEY BECOME SUCCESSFUL STEM MAJORS? IN  
16 PRINCIPLE, WE HAVE TEN YEARS OF STUDENTS TO GO BACK  
17 TO WHERE WE COULD EVALUATE OUTCOMES AND GET SOME  
18 IDEA OF WHAT PARTS OF THE PROGRAM ARE GOOD AND WHAT  
19 PARTS MIGHT NEED TO BE REVISED.

20 I SPENT MY LUNCH HOUR ON AN NAS CALL ABOUT  
21 EXACTLY THIS SORT OF ISSUE. AND THERE IS A HUGE  
22 AMOUNT OF EMPHASIS ON BEING SURE WE GET OUTCOMES  
23 DATA SO THAT WE KNOW WHAT DOES WORK AND WHAT DOESN'T  
24 WORK. BUT I CAN UNDERSTAND THIS MIGHT TOO HARD IN  
25 THIS CASE, BUT I'D LOVE TO KNOW IT.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 DR. SHEPARD: DID YOU WANT ME TO SPEAK ON  
2 THAT OR DOES MARIA? I SEE YOUR HAND IS RAISED.

3 DR. MILLAN: CHAIRMAN THOMAS, I HAVE A  
4 QUESTION FOR THE BOARD JUST BASED ON THIS  
5 DISCUSSION.

6 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES, PLEASE.

7 DR. MILLAN: SO, DR. GOLDSTEIN, SO WHEN  
8 LAST KELLY REPORTED ON THIS, WHAT SHE REPORTED ON  
9 WAS THAT OUT OF 482 STUDENTS WHO COMPLETED  
10 INTERNSHIPS SINCE 2012, THERE WAS JUST A REPORT, AND  
11 IT WAS AN INCOMPLETE REPORT. SO WE CERTAINLY SHOULD  
12 BE VERY DELIBERATE ABOUT FOLLOWING UP ON ALL OF THE  
13 GRADUATES FROM THIS PROGRAM. SO THAT IS A VERY  
14 IMPORTANT THING TO DO AND WE WILL DO THAT.

15 OF THE 76 ALUMNI WHO DID REPORT, SO THERE  
16 WERE ONLY 76 ALUMNI WHO REPORTED THEY ALL WENT TO  
17 COLLEGE, BUT THAT MAY BE A SELECTION BIAS. AND THEN  
18 50 PERCENT OF THOSE WHO REPORTED AND WENT TO  
19 COLLEGE, 50 PERCENT WENT TO A UC, 18 PERCENT WENT  
20 ANOTHER CALIFORNIA SCHOOL, INCLUDING STANFORD,  
21 CALTECH, AND CSU'S, AND 32 PERCENT ATTENDED SCHOOLS  
22 OUTSIDE OF CALIFORNIA, AND THESE INCLUDED YALE,  
23 COLUMBIA, HARVARD, HOPKINS, DUKE, SO OTHER TYPES OF  
24 INSTITUTIONS.

25 SO I WANTED TO, NO. 1, SAY THAT WE WILL

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 DELIBERATELY AND PROACTIVELY AS WELL AS FOR FUTURE  
2 PROGRAMS FOLLOW UP ON THE OUTCOMES. ALSO A REQUEST  
3 FROM YOU AND FROM MEMBERS OF THE BOARD, IF YOU HAVE  
4 SUGGESTIONS IN TERMS OF OUTCOMES, ESPECIALLY FROM  
5 YOUR RECENT MEETING, OF WHAT YOU THINK SHOULD BE  
6 FOLLOWED, WE WOULD WELCOME THAT TO BRING IN SO WE  
7 CAN INCORPORATE THAT INTO OUR REPORTING AS WELL.

8 AND THEN THE SECOND PIECE THAT I WANTED TO  
9 ASK THE BOARD IS, BASED ON THE INPUT TODAY, IT  
10 SOUNDS LIKE A COUPLE OF THINGS SHOULD BE EMPHASIZED  
11 WHEN THIS IS PRESENTED TO THE FULL BOARD. ONE IS,  
12 NO. 1, TO EMPHASIZE THAT TRULY THE VALUE OF THESE  
13 PAID INTERNSHIPS IS HIGHLIGHTED BECAUSE THAT'S  
14 SOMETHING THAT THE GENERAL PUBLIC AND THE GENERAL  
15 STAKEHOLDER POPULATION SHOULD BE VERY MUCH AWARE OF  
16 THAT THIS IS THE INTENT BEHIND THE STRUCTURE AND THE  
17 FUNDING.

18 THE SECOND PIECE IS TO DO A LITTLE BIT  
19 MORE IN TERMS OF REPORTING ON WHAT KIND OF PROGRESS  
20 REPORTS COME TO US AND HOW WE MEASURE HOW THE  
21 PROGRAMS ARE ON TRACK. AND THEN THE THIRD PIECE IS  
22 SHARE GENERAL OUTCOMES, BUT MAYBE SPEAK  
23 PROSPECTIVELY THAT THERE WILL BE A COMMITMENT TO  
24 FOLLOWING OUTCOME MEASURES.

25 AND SO I WANTED TO ASK WHETHER THOSE THREE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 COMPONENTS WOULD BE USEFUL FOR THE FULL BOARD  
2 PRESENTATION.

3 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES. PLUS YOU GOT A  
4 THUMBS UP FROM LARRY.

5 KRISTINA.

6 DR. VUORI: THANKS, J.T. WANTED TO FOLLOW  
7 UP WITH EITHER MARIA OR LARRY OR WHOEVER MIGHT BE  
8 BEST SUITED TO ANSWER MY QUESTION. AND THAT IS THAT  
9 WHAT DO YOU THINK SUCCESS LOOKS LIKE FOR THIS TYPE  
10 OF A PROGRAM? HAS NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES COME  
11 UP WITH SORT OF AN OUTCOMES THAT ONE SHOULD MEASURE  
12 THAT INDICATE A SUCCESS OF A PROGRAM? CAN ONE  
13 PRESCRIBE THOSE AS LEADING OR LACKING INDICATORS OF  
14 THE SUCCESS OF THE PROGRAM, OR IS THIS JUST TOO  
15 DIFFICULT AT THIS STAGE OF QUOTE, UNQUOTE CAREER?

16 DR. GOLDSTEIN: SO IF I CAN BRIEFLY  
17 RESPOND TO THAT. THERE WERE A LOT OF DIFFERENT  
18 OUTCOME MEASURES THAT WERE DISCUSSED TODAY. I THINK  
19 IT'S A MOVING TARGET STILL IN TERMS OF  
20 FORMALIZATION. THERE ARE A LOT OF SUCCESSFUL  
21 UNDERGRADUATE AND GRADUATE PROGRAMS OUT THERE THAT  
22 ONE COULD LOOK TO FOR POSSIBLE OUTCOME MEASURES IN  
23 TERMS OF THE DEI SPACE. BUT I THINK FOR HIGH  
24 SCHOOLS STUDENTS, MY GUT INSTINCT IS THAT YOU WANT  
25 TO BE SURE THAT THEY MAKE IT TO A GOOD COLLEGE, THAT

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 YOU'D LIKE TO KNOW DO THEY DO A STEM MAJOR. AND  
2 THEN IF YOU HAVE DATA BEYOND THAT, GRADUATE SCHOOL,  
3 MEDICAL SCHOOL, OR EMPLOYMENT IN ONE OF THE STEM  
4 INDUSTRIES PERHAPS.

5 SO I THINK -- AND I GUESS THE OTHER POINT  
6 I'D MAKE IS I CERTAINLY APPRECIATE THAT TRACKING  
7 DOWN ALL THESE KIDS AND FINDING OUT WHAT THEY'RE  
8 DOING AND GETTING THEM TO RESPOND BY MAIL TO FORMS  
9 AND ALL THE REST, AND THEY HAVE 17 ADDRESSES BY THE  
10 TIME THEY'RE 19 YEARS OLD, I GOT IT. IT MAY BE THAT  
11 THE PROGRAM DIRECTORS OUGHT TO BE THE ONES WHO HAVE  
12 PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY, AT LEAST INITIALLY, FOR  
13 TRACKING THEIR STUDENTS. THEY KNOW THEM. THEY HAVE  
14 PERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH THOSE KIDS AND POSSIBLY  
15 WITH THEIR FAMILIES.

16 DR. MILLAN: SO IN RESPONSE TO THAT  
17 RESPONSE, DOES THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMEND  
18 THAT WE ADD A PROVISION IN THE ACTIVITIES PROGRAM  
19 DIRECTORS TRACKING OUTCOMES THAT THEN GET  
20 PROSPECTIVELY, NOT JUST WHAT'S HAPPENING DURING THE  
21 COURSE OF THE INTERNSHIP, AS ONE OF THE ACTIVITIES  
22 THAT WE WOULD REQUIRE FROM THE PROGRAM DIRECTORS?

23 DR. VUORI: THAT WOULD BE GREAT.

24 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I THINK THAT WOULD BE AN  
25 EXCELLENT IDEA. THANK YOU, LARRY, FOR SUGGESTING

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 THAT.

2 OKAY. ARE THERE OTHER QUESTIONS OR  
3 COMMENTS? AND IF NOT, WE NEED A MOTION TO APPROVE  
4 AS KELLY HAS LAID OUT THE REQUESTED ACTION. DO I  
5 HEAR SUCH A MOTION?

6 DR. DULIEGE: YEAH. I CAN DO THE MOTION.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: IS THERE A SECOND?

8 DR. GASSON: SECOND.

9 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: BEEN MOVED AND SECONDED.  
10 ANY FURTHER DISCUSSION BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD? DO  
11 WE HAVE ANY PUBLIC COMMENT ON THIS MOTION? HEARING  
12 NONE, MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE CALL THE ROLL.

13 MS. BONNEVILLE: OS STEWARD. DEBORAH  
14 DEAS. ANNE-MARIE DULIEGE.

15 DR. DULIEGE: YES.

16 MS. BONNEVILLE: JUDY GASSON.

17 DR. GASSON: YES.

18 MS. BONNEVILLE: LARRY GOLDSTEIN.

19 DR. GOLDSTEIN: YES.

20 MS. BONNEVILLE: DAVID HIGGINS. STEVE  
21 JUELSGAARD.

22 MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.

23 MS. BONNEVILLE: SHLOMO MELMED.

24 DR. MELMED: YES.

25 MS. BONNEVILLE: ART TORRES.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 MR. TORRES: AYE.

2 MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.

3 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.

4 MS. BONNEVILLE: KRISTINA VUORI.

5 DR. VUORI: YES.

6 MS. BONNEVILLE: MOTION CARRIES.

7 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU. AND, KELLY,  
8 THANK YOU VERY MUCH AGAIN FOR OVERSEEING THIS  
9 TERRIFIC PROGRAM.

10 DR. SHEPARD: THANK YOU TOO. I HAVE TO  
11 GIVE CREDIT TO THE PEOPLE WHO MANAGED THE PROGRAM  
12 BEFORE ME. SO MANI VESSEL AND STEVEN BOTH MANAGED  
13 AND KAREN RING AS WELL. THEY ARE ALL NO LONGER AT  
14 CIRM, BUT THEY DID THE DUE DILIGENCE ON THIS  
15 PROGRAM, AND HOPEFULLY IT WILL CONTINUE IN THE  
16 FUTURE AND WILL BE EVEN MORE SUCCESSFUL. SO I'M  
17 GOING TO STOP SHARING MY SCREEN NOW AND THANK YOU,  
18 EVERYONE.

19 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. ON TO ITEM 4,  
20 CONSIDERATION OF SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING FOR THE  
21 EXISTING ALPHA STEM CELL CLINICS NETWORK. I  
22 UNDERSTAND, JEN, YOU ARE GOING TO BE PRESENTING ON  
23 THIS.

24 MS. LEWIS: THANK YOU, J.T. LET ME TRY TO  
25 SHARE MY SCREEN. CAN YOU SEE THIS?

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.

2 MS. LEWIS: THANK YOU, J.T., AND MEMBERS  
3 OF THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE. I'LL BE PRESENTING TO  
4 YOU A PROPOSAL TODAY FOR SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING FOR  
5 THE ALPHA STEM CELL CLINICS.

6 SO JUST A REMINDER. IN JANUARY THE CIRM  
7 TEAM PRESENTED AN UPDATE ON THIS PROGRAM TO THE  
8 ICOC. AND AS YOU KNOW, THE ALPHA STEM CELL CLINICS  
9 IS A NETWORK WITH A \$40 MILLION INVESTMENT BY CIRM  
10 AND PERSONNEL TRAINING IN PATIENT-CENTERED CARE.  
11 AND THESE CLINICS SUCCESSFULLY ARE ACCELERATING CELL  
12 AND GENE THERAPY CLINICAL TRIALS ACROSS THE STATE  
13 WITH OVER 105 TRIALS SUPPORTED SINCE 2015, 82 FROM  
14 INDUSTRY SPONSORS, 23 ARE CIRM-FUNDED INDUSTRY AND  
15 ACADEMIC SPONSORS, AND THIS IS OVER \$57 MILLION IN  
16 INDUSTRY CONTRACTS.

17 AND THE FIRST THREE CLINICS WERE LAUNCHED  
18 IN 2015 AT CITY OF HOPE, UCLA, UC IRVINE, AND UC SAN  
19 DIEGO. AND THE OTHER TWO WERE LAUNCHED IN 2017 AT  
20 UC DAVIS AND UCSF.

21 SO CURRENTLY ALL OF THE FIVE EXISTING  
22 AWARDS IN THE ALPHA STEM CELL CLINICS PROGRAM HAVE  
23 ENDED OR THEY ARE APPROACHING THEIR AWARD END DATE  
24 LATER IN 2021. AND A NEW CONCEPT PROPOSAL FOR THIS  
25 NETWORK, ALONG WITH ANY OTHER ITEMS IN THE PROP 14,

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 WOULD BE BROUGHT TO THE ICOC WITH THE STRATEGIC PLAN  
2 ROLLOUT LATER THIS YEAR IN DECEMBER. THUS, A  
3 TARGETED RELAUNCH RFA FOR THIS PROGRAM WOULDN'T BE  
4 UNTIL MID-2022. THUS, THERE IS A CHALLENGE AS THE  
5 ALPHA CLINICS DIRECTORS HAVE REPORTED THAT BRIDGE  
6 FUNDING IS NEEDED TO SUPPORT CRITICAL PERSONNEL AND  
7 CONTINUED OPERATIONS DURING THIS PERIOD OF THEIR  
8 AWARD AND POSSIBLE OPPORTUNITY FOR NEW FUNDING IN  
9 2022.

10 SO THIS SLIDE GIVES YOU AN OVERVIEW OF THE  
11 FIVE AWARDS IN OUR PORTFOLIO. AS YOU CAN SEE, THE  
12 FIRST TWO AWARDS ENDED AT CITY OF HOPE AND UCLA AT  
13 THE END OF 2020 AND EARLY 2021. AND THE FINAL THREE  
14 AWARDS ARE ANTICIPATED TO END IN JULY AND NOVEMBER  
15 OF THIS YEAR.

16 I WOULD LIKE TO NOTE THAT THE TWO AWARDS  
17 LISTED THAT LAUNCHED IN 2017 WERE LAUNCHED WITH  
18 OPERATIONAL MILESTONES. SO YOU WILL SEE HERE THAT  
19 THEY WERE CONTRACTED WITH AN AWARD END DATE OF  
20 NOVEMBER 2021; HOWEVER, SINCE THEY WERE LAUNCHED  
21 WITH OPERATIONAL MILESTONES, THE END DATE OF THE  
22 AWARD IS ACTUALLY DETERMINED BY WHEN THAT FINAL  
23 MILESTONE IS ACHIEVED. THESE TWO AWARDEES HAVE TOLD  
24 US THAT THEY HAVE REACHED THEIR FINAL MILESTONE  
25 EARLY IN MAY OF 2021; AND, THUS, YOU WILL SEE IN

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 THAT FINAL COLUMN THE POTENTIAL GAP OF FUNDING COULD  
2 BE UP TO 12 MONTHS.

3 SO BASED ON THE FINANCIAL REPORTING  
4 RECEIVED FROM THIS PORTFOLIO, THE AVERAGE ANNUAL  
5 EXPENDITURES PER AWARD IS \$1,360,000 WITH AN AVERAGE  
6 ANNUAL DIRECT COST PER AWARD OF \$1,000,060, AND THE  
7 AVERAGE FACILITIES RATE AMONGST THE FIVE AWARDEES IS  
8 AROUND 22 PERCENT.

9 TODAY WE ARE BRINGING TO YOU A PROPOSAL  
10 FOR A ONE-YEAR SUPPLEMENT FROM JUNE OF 2021 TO MAY  
11 OF 2022 WHEN WE ANTICIPATE A NEW RFA COULD BE  
12 LAUNCHED. AND THIS SUPPLEMENT WOULD SUPPORT TALENT  
13 RETENTION AND PROGRAM ACTIVITIES THAT ARE SPECIFIED  
14 IN THE ORIGINAL RFA CONCEPT, WHICH INCLUDE  
15 COORDINATION OF CLINICAL RESEARCH AND MANUFACTURING  
16 TEAMS, REGULATORY SUPPORT OF THE CLINICAL OPERATIONS  
17 AND MANAGEMENT, AND SENIOR CLINICAL RESEARCH  
18 COORDINATORS, PRODUCT PROCESSING, BIOSPECIMIN  
19 COLLECTION AND COORDINATION, MANAGEMENT OF THE  
20 PATIENT AND PUBLIC INQUIRIES, AND FEE-FOR-SERVICE  
21 CONTRACTING.

22 THIS ALLOCATION WOULD BE FOR A MAXIMUM  
23 AMOUNT OF \$1.1 MILLION IN DIRECT PROJECT COSTS PLUS  
24 ANY ASSOCIATED FACILITIES COSTS FOR EACH AWARD.  
25 AWARDEES WILL BE REQUIRED TO SUBMIT A JUSTIFICATION

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 FOR THIS FUNDING ALONG WITH A DETAILED BUDGET FOR  
2 THE CIRM TEAM'S REVIEW. AND AWARDEES WITH PROJECT  
3 PERIODS LESS THAN 12 MONTHS WOULD BE REQUIRED TO  
4 REDUCE THEIR DIRECT COSTS IN PROPORTION BASED ON THE  
5 AVERAGE EXPENDITURE BURN RATE FROM THEIR FINANCIAL  
6 REPORTING OF ABOUT \$92,000 PER MONTH.

7 THUS, THIS PROPOSAL IS A TOTAL ALLOCATION  
8 OF \$6,710,000 FOR THESE FIVE SUPPLEMENTAL AWARDS.

9 THIS IS JUST A SUMMARY OF THE BUDGET  
10 PROPOSAL. AGAIN, THE AVERAGE ANNUAL EXPENDITURES  
11 ARE 1.35 MILLION WITH THE AVERAGE ANNUAL DIRECT COST  
12 PER AWARD OF 1.06 MILLION, AND FACILITIES RATES HAVE  
13 AVERAGED AROUND 22 PERCENT. WE ARE PROPOSING A  
14 TOTAL SUPPLEMENT PER AWARDEE OF 1.1 MILLION DIRECT  
15 COSTS, WHICH WOULD BE UP TO 1.34 MILLION IN TOTAL  
16 COSTS FOR FIVE AWARDEES WITH A PROPOSED ALLOCATION  
17 OF 6.71 MILLION.

18 SO TODAY WE ARE ASKING THAT THE SCIENCE  
19 SUBCOMMITTEE CONSIDER THIS PROPOSAL TO RECOMMEND  
20 THIS TO THE ICOC FOR AN ALPHA CLINIC SUPPLEMENT OF A  
21 TOTAL ALLOCATION OF 6.71 MILLION.

22 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, JEN. ARE  
23 THERE QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE  
24 BOARD?

25 MR. JUELSGAARD: YES. I ACTUALLY HAVE A

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 SERIES OF QUESTIONS. SO I'M GOING TO START WITH THE  
2 FIRST ONE, WHICH IS WHAT WAS THE EXPECTATION OF THE  
3 ALPHA CLINICS WHEN THEY RECEIVED THEIR ORIGINAL  
4 ALLOTMENT OF MONEY? WAS THERE AN EXPECTATION THEY  
5 WERE GOING TO RECEIVE MORE? THAT'S SORT OF QUESTION  
6 ONE.

7 QUESTION TWO IS THE ONLY REASON WE'RE ABLE  
8 TO EVEN CONSIDER THIS, I THINK, FOR THE LARGE PART  
9 IS BECAUSE OF PROPOSITION 14. MAYBE WE HAVE SOME  
10 FUNDS LEFT OVER THAT MIGHT HAVE GONE TO DO THIS.  
11 BUT IF WE DIDN'T, WHAT WERE THEIR BACKUP PLANS IN  
12 THE EVENT THAT THERE WASN'T ANY ADDITIONAL FUNDING  
13 AVAILABLE FROM CIRM?

14 AND SORT OF THE THIRD QUESTION IS WAS  
15 THERE EVER AN EXPECTATION THAT THESE ALPHA CLINICS  
16 WOULD BECOME SELF-SUPPORTING THROUGH THE WORK THAT  
17 THEY'RE DOING, THINGS THAT THEY'RE CHARGING, BOTH  
18 THE FOR-PROFIT AND NONPROFIT SECTORS, IN TERMS OF  
19 CLINICAL TRIAL WORK?

20 SO IF YOU COULD SORT OF ADDRESS THOSE  
21 ISSUES BECAUSE I'M JUST REALLY CURIOUS ABOUT WHAT  
22 THEIR BACKUP PLAN WAS IN ALL OF THIS.

23 DR. MILLAN: I CAN RESPOND TO THAT, STEVE.  
24 SO WITH THE ORIGINAL RFA, THE EXPECTATION WAS THAT  
25 THIS WOULD BE A ONE-TIME AWARD AT THE TIME OF THAT

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 RFA, THAT THE ALPHA CLINICS WOULD HAVE THE  
2 INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT TO BECOME SUSTAINABLE AS A  
3 UNIT TO SUPPORT THE ACTIVITIES LAID OUT BY THE RFA.  
4 AND AS YOU'VE MENTIONED, PROP 14 PROVIDES FOR  
5 EXPANSION OF THE ALPHA CLINICS. SO THE IDEA BEHIND  
6 ASKING FOR A SUPPLEMENT IS IF THEY GO BACK DOWN TO  
7 THE BARE BONES AND CONTINUE TO JUST SUPPORT WHAT  
8 THEY COULD BASED ON THEIR SUSTAINABILITY PLAN, THAT  
9 LEVEL OF SUPPORT WOULD BE PROBABLY SUFFICIENT FOR  
10 SOME ASPECTS OF WHAT THE ALPHA CLINICS NETWORK DOES,  
11 BUT PERHAPS MAY NOT BE SUPPORTIVE OF KIND OF A  
12 BROADER VISION, ESPECIALLY WITH THE FUTURE  
13 EXPANSION.

14 SO THE IDEA IS TO MAINTAIN A LEVEL OF  
15 EXPERTISE AND PERSONNEL BEYOND WHAT THEY MAY BE  
16 DOING WHEN THEY SUPPORT THINGS SUCH AS SPONSORED  
17 RESEARCH, ET CETERA. WE ARE NOT PREPARED YET TO  
18 PRESENT THE FULL ALPHA CLINICS EXPANSION PROPOSAL  
19 BECAUSE THAT WILL COME IN WITH STRATEGIC PLAN LATER  
20 ON IN THE YEAR OR AT LEAST INTRODUCED WITH THE  
21 STRATEGIC PLAN AND THEN BROUGHT FORWARD FOR A FORMAL  
22 CONSIDERATION.

23 BUT THE EXPECTATION IS THE ROLE OF THE  
24 ALPHA CLINICS WILL BE EXPANDED BEYOND WHAT THE  
25 ORIGINAL INTENT OF THE ALPHA CLINICS NETWORK WAS

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 WHEN IT WAS SET UP FIVE TO SEVEN YEARS AGO. WE ARE  
2 NOT PROPOSING THAT WE ALREADY INCORPORATE NEW  
3 ACTIVITIES INTO THIS BUDGET BECAUSE THAT WHOLE  
4 CONCEPT NEEDS TO BE EVALUATED BY THE BOARD AND  
5 REALLY EXAMINED. BUT THE IDEA OF WHAT'S PROPOSED  
6 HERE IS TO MAINTAIN A CERTAIN LEVEL OF ACTIVITIES  
7 RELATED TO THE SCOPE THAT WAS OUTLINED IN THE  
8 ORIGINAL RFA. I HOPE THAT ANSWERS THE QUESTIONS.

9 MR. JUELSGAARD: JUST ONE FOLLOW-UP  
10 PLEASE. MARIA, ALONG THE WAY YOU MENTIONED THAT THE  
11 ORIGINAL PLAN WAS AFTER FIVE YEARS THE INSTITUTIONS  
12 WOULD BASICALLY TAKE OVER THE RUNNING OF THESE ALPHA  
13 CLINICS. THAT WAS THE ORIGINAL VISION; IS THAT  
14 CORRECT?

15 DR. MILLAN: YES. AND, OF COURSE, THE  
16 IDEA WAS THAT THE INSTITUTION WOULD BE ABLE TO  
17 CONTINUE THE SUPPORT OF CLINICAL TRIALS TO AN EXTENT  
18 WITH THESE CLINICS. WE DIDN'T HAVE ANY  
19 SPECIFICATION IN TERMS OF THE LEVEL OF SUPPORT, ET  
20 CETERA, BUT THAT THERE WOULD BE THE ABILITY TO  
21 SUPPORT THE CLINICAL TRIALS THAT WERE SUPPORTED BY  
22 THE ALPHA CLINICS AS LAID OUT IN THE ORIGINAL  
23 CONCEPT.

24 MR. JUELSGAARD: THIS IS JUST A COMMENT.  
25 IT WOULD BE NICE, FROM MY POINT OF VIEW, IF WE ARE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 GOING TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL FUNDING TO THESE ALPHA  
2 CLINICS, THAT WE MIGHT HAVE A COST SHARING  
3 ARRANGEMENT WITH THE INSTITUTION THAT'S INVOLVED  
4 WITH THEM SO THAT, BACK TO THE ORIGINAL CONCEPT,  
5 THEY HAVE SOME SKIN IN THE GAME IN TERMS OF MAKING  
6 SURE THAT THESE CLINICS ARE BEING FINANCIALLY  
7 SUPPORTED. IT'S A COMMENT, A REFLECTION.

8 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, STEVE. THOSE  
9 ARE ALL GOOD POINTS. IT DEFINITELY WAS THE IDEA TO  
10 BE SELF-SUSTAINING AT THE OUTSET, AND IT'S A MATTER  
11 FOR THE BOARD TO DECIDE IF YOU WANT TO PUT  
12 ADDITIONAL FUNDING IN OR NOT. I THINK WE CAN SAFELY  
13 ASSUME EACH OF THESE INSTITUTIONS WILL BE BACK IF WE  
14 DECIDE TO EXPAND THE PROGRAM WITH A SUBSEQUENT RFA,  
15 AND I THINK WE CAN ALSO FULLY ANTICIPATE THERE WILL  
16 BE OTHER INSTITUTIONS APPLYING AT THAT POINT AS  
17 WELL. ALL MATTERS FOR DELIBERATION FOR THE BOARD.

18 DR. MELMED: I JUST WAS CURIOUS. WE  
19 DIDN'T SAY ANYTHING -- THERE'S NO PEER REVIEW OF  
20 THIS REQUEST. THIS HASN'T UNDERGONE ANY PEER REVIEW  
21 AT ALL. JUST CAN YOU TELL US, IF IT HASN'T, CAN YOU  
22 GIVE US THE RATIONALE WHY YOU'RE BRINGING A \$7  
23 MILLION EXPENSE TO US WITHOUT HAVING UNDERGONE PEER  
24 REVIEW?

25 MS. LEWIS: SURE. SO THESE ARE FIVE

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 AWARDS THAT HAVE GONE THROUGH PEER REVIEW.

2 DR. MELMED: I UNDERSTAND THAT, BUT I'M  
3 TALKING ABOUT FOR THIS REQUEST.

4 MS. LEWIS: SURE. THIS REQUEST IS NOT A  
5 NEW PROPOSAL, IT'S NOT NEW ACTIVITIES. IT'S  
6 PROVIDING JUST BRIDGE FUNDING FOR THE ACTIVITIES  
7 PROPOSED IN THEIR ORIGINAL APPLICATION FOR THE  
8 PERIOD OF TIME. SO IT'S NOT ANY NEW CONCEPT OR NEW  
9 ACTIVITIES OR A NEW EVALUATION OR A NEW APPLICATION.

10 DR. MELMED: DOESN'T THE STATUTE REQUIRE  
11 US TO SPEND FUNDS ON PEER-REVIEWED RESEARCH? THE  
12 PROPOSITION LANGUAGE. I'M JUST ASKING.

13 MS. LEWIS: JAMES, CAN YOU PROVIDE YOUR  
14 EXPERTISE?

15 MR. HARRISON: SURE. I'D BE HAPPY TO  
16 RESPOND.

17 YES, DR. MELMED, THE LANGUAGE OF THE  
18 STATUTE DOES REQUIRE PEER REVIEW OF SCIENTIFIC  
19 PROPOSALS. AS JEN EXPLAINED, IN THIS CASE A  
20 DETERMINATION WAS MADE THAT PEER REVIEW WAS NOT  
21 REQUIRED BECAUSE WE WOULD BE FUNDING THE SAME  
22 ACTIVITIES THAT WERE THE SUBJECT OF THE PRIOR PEER  
23 REVIEW FOR AN ADDITIONAL INCREMENT OF TIME.

24 DR. MELMED: THANK YOU.

25 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: STEVE.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 MR. JUELSGAARD: I WANT TO GET TO THE SAME  
2 POINT THAT DR. MELMED WAS GETTING TO BUT IN A  
3 DIFFERENT WAY. WERE THESE REQUESTS FOR MONEY  
4 PRESSURE TESTED? DID SOMEBODY GO BACK AND SAY,  
5 OKAY, CAN YOU OUTLINE LINE BY LINE WHERE YOU HAVE  
6 ALL THIS MONEY THAT YOU ARE REQUESTING, WHERE IT'S  
7 NEEDED? I HOPE IT'S JUST NOT SOMEBODY COMING IN AND  
8 SAYING THAT IS WHAT I NEED TO CONTINUE FOR THE X  
9 NUMBER OF MONTHS. I HOPE YOU'VE GOT A REAL ITEMIZED  
10 DESCRIPTION OF WHY THEY NEED THIS MONEY. WAS THAT  
11 THE CASE?

12 MS. LEWIS: SURE. SO FOR THIS REQUEST FOR  
13 THE ACTUAL AMOUNT, THAT WAS DETERMINED BY THEIR  
14 ACTUAL EXPENDITURES THROUGH THEIR FINANCIAL  
15 REPORTING AND WHAT THEY'VE SPENT IN THEIR REPORTING  
16 PERIOD.

17 IN TERMS OF HOW WE REVIEW THEIR PROPOSALS,  
18 THEY WILL SUBMIT THEIR PROPOSAL OF ACTIVITIES AND A  
19 BUDGET JUSTIFICATION. AGAIN, THESE ARE FOR  
20 ESSENTIAL PERSONNEL AND KEY OPERATIONS. SO IT WILL  
21 BE EVALUATED BY PROGRAM STAFF AND GRANTS MANAGEMENT.  
22 SO IT'S AN UP-TO AMOUNT AND DOESN'T MEAN THAT THE  
23 TOTAL AWARD AMOUNT WILL BE ALLOCATED.

24 MR. JUELSGAARD: OKAY. GREAT. GOOD.

25 MS. BONNEVILLE: J.T., YOU'RE ON MUTE.

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I DO THAT BECAUSE I'M  
2 EXPECTING MY DOG TO BARK ON CUE EVERY TIME I'M ABOUT  
3 READY TO SAY SOMETHING.

4 ANY OTHER COMMENTS, QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS  
5 OF THE BOARD? MARIA.

6 DR. MILLAN: I'M JUST SEEKING DIRECTION  
7 FROM THE BOARD BASED ON STEVE JUELSGAARD'S COMMENTS  
8 ON COST SHARING. I WAS WONDERING IF THE BOARD  
9 WANTED TO DISCUSS THAT FURTHER AND GIVE INSTRUCTIONS  
10 BACK TO US IN TERMS OF WHETHER YOU WOULD WISH TO  
11 HAVE THAT INCLUDED INTO A CONCEPT BROUGHT FORWARD TO  
12 THE FULL BOARD.

13 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: THANK YOU, MARIA. VERY  
14 GOOD QUESTION. SO WE DON'T HAVE A MOTION YET.  
15 STEVE, WOULD YOU LIKE TO PROPOSE A MOTION THAT WOULD  
16 INCORPORATE THAT THOUGHT IF YOU DEEM APPROPRIATE?

17 MR. JUELSGAARD: YES, I'D BE HAPPY TO.  
18 THE MOTION WOULD, IN ESSENCE, APPROVE THE REQUESTED  
19 ACTION, BUT WITH THE ADDITIONAL PROVISIO THAT THE  
20 ACTUAL MONEY ALLOCATED BE SPLIT 50-50 WITH THE  
21 INSTITUTION. IN OTHER WORDS, THE INSTITUTION WOULD  
22 PROVIDE AS MUCH SUPPORT AS CIRM IS SUPPORTING FOR  
23 THE AMOUNT OF MONEY THEY'VE REQUESTED OR THEY WILL  
24 BE REQUESTING.

25 MR. TORRES: IS THERE A SECOND?

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I WAS JUST ABOUT TO ASK.  
2 ARE YOU SECONDING, ART? IS THERE A SECOND TO THE  
3 MOTION?

4 DR. DULIEGE: I SECOND.

5 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SECONDED BY ANNE-MARIE.  
6 FURTHER DISCUSSION BY MEMBERS OF THE BOARD?

7 MR. TORRES: YES, J.T., IT'S ART. I ONLY  
8 HAVE ONE CONCERN, AND THAT IS THESE APPLICATIONS  
9 WERE NOT --

10 MR. HARRISON: I'M SORRY TO INTERRUPT, BUT  
11 YOU'RE IN CONFLICT ON THIS ONE.

12 MR. TORRES: SORRY. BYE.

13 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. COMMENTS OR  
14 QUESTIONS ON THE MOTION AS PRESENTED BY STEVE AND  
15 SECONDED BY ANNE-MARIE? PHRASED DIFFERENTLY, IS  
16 THERE ANYBODY WHO THINKS THAT IT'S NOT REASONABLE TO  
17 HAVE COST SHARING?

18 MR. JUELSGAARD: I THINK THE VOTE WILL  
19 DEAL WITH THAT. IF THIS GETS VOTED DOWN, THEN WE'LL  
20 HAVE TO HAVE A DIFFERENT CONCEPT.

21 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: I'M JUST TRYING TO SORT  
22 OF STREAMLINE THE PROCESS A BIT, STEVE. I THINK YOU  
23 ARE GOING TO GET A LOT OF SUPPORT FOR THAT IDEA.

24 OKAY. HEARING NO FURTHER COMMENT, ANY  
25 COMMENT BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC? HEARING NONE,

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 MARIA, WILL YOU PLEASE CALL ALL THE ROLL.

2 MS. BONNEVILLE: DEBORAH DEAS. ANNE-MARIE  
3 DULIEGE.

4 DR. DULIEGE: YES.

5 MS. BONNEVILLE: STEVE JUELSGAARD.

6 MR. JUELSGAARD: YES.

7 MS. BONNEVILLE: SHLOMO MELMED.

8 DR. MELMED: YES.

9 MS. BONNEVILLE: JONATHAN THOMAS.

10 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: YES.

11 MS. BONNEVILLE: THE MOTION CARRIES.

12 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THANK YOU. AND,  
13 JEN, EXCELLENT PRESENTATION. THANK YOU FOR ALL YOUR  
14 HARD WORK ON THIS AS WELL AS EVERYBODY ELSE WHO'S  
15 WORKING TO MAKE THE ALPHA CLINICS PROGRAM SUCH THE  
16 GREAT SUCCESS THAT IT IS. THANK YOU.

17 DR. MILLAN: CHAIRMAN THOMAS, MAY I ASK  
18 ONE PARTING QUESTION FOR THE BOARD? ALONG WITH THIS  
19 MOTION, IS THE BUDGET AS JENNIFER LEWIS PRESENTED  
20 IT, WOULD WE PRESENT THE SAME BUDGET BUT WITH THE  
21 COST SHARING PROVISION, THAT THAT WOULD DOUBLE THE  
22 AMOUNT THAT COULD BE EXPENDED WITHIN THE ALPHA  
23 CLINICS? JUST WANT TO MAKE SURE THAT WE ARE CLEAR  
24 ON THAT.

25 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: SO AS I UNDERSTAND IT,

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 STEVE'S MOTION WAS TO TAKE THE NUMBERS AS JEN  
2 PRESENTED THEM WITH THE BUDGET PRESENTED AND REQUIRE  
3 THAT THE INSTITUTIONS COVER HALF THAT. IS THAT  
4 CORRECT, STEVE?

5 MR. JUELSGAARD: YES. WHATEVER FUNDS THAT  
6 THEY REQUEST, THAT REQUEST WILL INCLUDE THAT THEY  
7 WILL PROVIDE HALF OF -- THEY'LL PROVIDE FUNDING  
8 EQUAL TO THE AMOUNT THAT THEY'RE GOING TO REQUEST.

9 DR. MILLAN: BUT THE AWARD MAX AS JEN HAD  
10 PRESENTED, ARE YOU PROPOSING THAT WE CUT THAT IN  
11 HALF, OR ARE YOU PROPOSING THAT THAT WILL STAY AS  
12 LONG AS THEY HAVE A JUSTIFIABLE BUDGET THAT'S TWICE  
13 THAT AND MATCHING IT 50-50?

14 MR. JUELSGAARD: SO THE QUESTION IS WOULD  
15 THEY USE THAT TO BOOTSTRAP NEW ACTIVITIES BECAUSE I  
16 DON'T THINK WE WANT TO DO THAT IS WHAT I HEARD.

17 DR. MILLAN: OKAY. SO IT WOULD BE HALF  
18 THE BUDGET ESSENTIALLY.

19 MR. JUELSGAARD: YES. THAT'S THE GIST OF  
20 IT ALL. YES, I AGREE.

21 DR. MILLAN: THANK YOU.

22 CHAIRMAN THOMAS: OKAY. THAT CONCLUDES  
23 THE ACTION ITEMS HERE. WE ARE DOWN TO PUBLIC  
24 COMMENT ON ANYTHING THAT ANYBODY WANTS TO DISCUSS.  
25 DO WE HAVE ANY SUCH PUBLIC COMMENT? HEARING NONE,

**BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR NO. 7152**

1 THAT THEN CONCLUDES THE MEETING TODAY. THE VOTES  
2 TAKEN TODAY WILL BE TAKEN TO THE MAY 17TH BOARD  
3 MEETING FOR FULL BOARD CONSIDERATION. AND WITH  
4 THAT, THANK YOU, EVERYBODY, FOR YOUR TIME, AND WE  
5 WILL SEE YOU IN A COUPLE WEEKS.

6 (THE MEETING WAS THEN CONCLUDED AT 2:56 P.M.)

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

**REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE**

I, BETH C. DRAIN, A CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER IN AND FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT OF THE ZOOM PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE SCIENCE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE INDEPENDENT CITIZEN'S OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE OF THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE IN THE MATTER OF ITS REGULAR MEETING HELD ON MAY 3, 2021, WAS HELD AS HEREIN APPEARS AND THAT THIS IS THE ORIGINAL TRANSCRIPT THEREOF AND THAT THE STATEMENTS THAT APPEAR IN THIS TRANSCRIPT WERE REPORTED STENOGRAPHICALLY BY ME AND TRANSCRIBED BY ME. I ALSO CERTIFY THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT IS A TRUE AND ACCURATE RECORD OF THE PROCEEDING.

BETH C. DRAIN, CA CSR 7152  
133 HENNA COURT  
SANDPOINT, IDAHO  
(208) 920-3543